UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/781,990	02/13/2001	Antti Forstadius	4925-58	2033

7590 06/29/2005	**EXAMINER**

Michael C. Stuart, Esq.
Cohen, Pontani,
Lieberman & Pavane
551 Fifth Avenue, Suite 1210
New York, NY 10176

LEE, ANDREW CHUNG CHEUNG

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2664	

DATE MAILED: 06/29/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>02/17/2005</u>.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL.**   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-35 and 37-61* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-35 and 37-61* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   The Office would like to thank the Applicants' amendments to the Specification

and Drawings as recommended as well as the remarks.

Specification

2.   The specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for

the claimed subject matter. See 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP § 608.01(o). Correction

of the following is required: Regarding claims 1, 13, Applicants disclose the claimed

subject matter "configuring an access point based RF network; Regarding claim 29,

Applicants disclose the claimed subject matter "self-configuring access point based RF

network"; Regarding to claim 39, Applicants disclose the claimed subject matter "self-

configuring RF network"; Regarding claims 46, 52, Applicants disclose the claimed

subject matter "self-configuring access point based RF network". Regarding claim 55,

Applicants disclose the claimed subject matter "configuring an access point based RF

network". The disclosure at the time of file does not support the claimed subject matter.

3.   The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

- The Office requires Applicants to provide clarification and explanation on the

    following (Refer to Amendment to Claims dated 02/17/2005) claimed subject

    matters:

    - Regarding claims 1, 13, Applicants disclose the claimed subject matter

        "configuring an access point based RF network;

- Regarding claim 29, Applicants disclose the claimed subject matter "self-configuring access point based RF network";

- Regarding to claim 39, Applicants disclose the claimed subject matter "self-configuring RF network";

- Regarding claims 46, 52, Applicants disclose the claimed subject matter "self-configuring access point based RF network".

- Regarding claim 55, Applicants disclose the claimed subject matter "configuring an access point based RF network".

Some of the claimed subject matters were not supported and disclosed by the Specification and the Drawings.

- Claim 37, the steps need to be rearranged. Step (a) to (e) are missing.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4.   The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

5.   Claims 1, 13, 29, 46, 52, 55 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Regarding Amendment to claims

dated 02/17/2005, claim 1, page 4, line 1 — the subject matter " an access point based

RF"; claim 13, page 4, line 1 — the subject matter " an access point based RF"; claim

29, page 8, line 1 — the subject matter " an access point based RF"; claim 46, page 13,

lines1 — the subject matter " an access point based RF"; claim 52, page 14, line 1 —

the subject matter " an access point based RF"; claim 55, page 15, line 1 — the subject

matter " an access point based RF"; The Office is not clear what and which access point

based RF network which the Applicants is referring to. The disclosure and the drawings

at the time of file by Applicants do not support the claimed subject matter.

Consequently, the Office raise double as "access point based " to possession of the

claimed invention at the time of file.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

6.   The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

7.   Claims 1, 13, 29, 46, 52, 55 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as

failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter

which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in

the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use

the invention. Regarding Amendment to Claims dated 02/17/2005,

- the subject matter "whereby *nodes* beyond a transmission range of *other*

  nodes but within transmission range of *intermediate nodes* become known to

said other nodes and become accessible to _said other nodes_ by relaying

through _said intermediate nodes_" as claimed in claim 1, page 4, lines 14 – 16;

- the subject matter "whereby _nodes_ beyond a transmission range of _other_

  nodes but within transmission range of _intermediate nodes_ become known to

  said other nodes and become accessible to _said other nodes_ by relaying

  through _said intermediate nodes_" as claimed in claim 13, page 6, lines 14 –

  16;

- the subject matter "whereby _nodes_ beyond a transmission range of _other_

  nodes but within transmission range of _intermediate nodes_ become known to

  said other nodes and become accessible to _said other nodes_ by relaying

  through _said intermediate nodes_" as claimed in claim 29, page 9, lines 18 –

  20;

- the subject matter "whereby _nodes_ beyond a transmission range of _the node_

  but within transmission range of _intermediate nodes_ become known to _the_

  node and become accessible to _the node_ by relaying through said

  intermediate nodes" as claimed in claim 46, page 13, lines 14 – 16;

- the subject matter "whereby _nodes_ beyond a transmission range of _other_

  nodes but within transmission range of _intermediate nodes_ become known to

  said other nodes and become accessible to _said other nodes_ by relaying

  through _said intermediate nodes_" as claimed in claim 52, page 15, lines 9 –

  11;

- the subject matter "whereby _nodes_ beyond a transmission range of _other_

    nodes but within transmission range of _intermediate nodes_ become known to

    said other nodes and become accessible to _said other nodes_ by relaying

    through _said intermediate nodes_" as claimed in claim 55, page 16, lines 3 – 5;

Regarding the above claimed paragraphs, the Office does not comprehend

completely what exactly Applicants to claim as to their possession of the claimed

invention at the time of file. Whereby nodes? which nodes?? Beyond a transmission

range of other nodes? A transmission range of which other nodes?? Intermediate

nodes become known to other nodes? Which intermediate nodes?? What does the term

"become know to" mean here in this sentence?? and which other nodes?? Do

Applicants mean the mobile unit/device connection from one piconet domain

handoff/handover to the other piconet domain or scatternet. The Specification and

drawings as disclosed do not describe clearly and exactly what nodes, other nodes,

intermediate nodes and transmission range. A better and clear illustrated diagram is

required to resolve this issue.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

8.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States

only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

9.   Claims 1, 13, 15, 46, 2, 4, 17, 19, 33, 3, 16, 18, 38, 5, 43, 50, 6, 20, 44, 51, 7, 21,

30, 8, 22, 9, 10, 11, 23, 24, 24, 31, 32, 34, 48, 49, 12, 14, 26 are urejected under 35

U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Plasson et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6795688 B1).

Regarding Claims 1, 13, 15, 46, Plasson et al. discloses the limitation of method

of configuring an access point RF network (Fig. 1, column 8, lines 29 – 44; column 14,

lines 47 – 50), the network comprising at least two nodes (Fig. 3A, column 10, lines 33 –

40), each having a controller (Fig. 1, elements 120 and 130; column 8, lines 23 - 28), a

data store (Fig.2, element 210; column 9, lines 43 – 50), and at least one transceiver for

communicating with other nodes (Fig. 2, elements 190, column 9, lines 59 – 62), each

transceiver having a unique identifier (Fig. 4A, element 410; column 12, lines 38 – 40;

column 15, lines 5 – 8), the method comprising the steps of: (a) the assigning a

predetermined value to a variable n (Fig. 4A, element 410; column 12, lines 38 – 40;

column 15, lines 5 – 8); (b) the selecting one certain of the nodes and associating it with

the value of n; (Fig. 4A, elements 410, 420; column 15, lines 5 – 8) (c) paging all other

nodes from a node associated with the value of n (column 3, lines 18 – 20); (d) in a

node associated with the value of n, noting nodes which reply to paging and associating

them with the value of (n+1) (Fig. 6, element 600, column 18, lines 47 – 51); (e) the

making all nodes associated with the value of n or with lower values unresponsive to

paging (Fig. 6, column 19, lines 1 – 7); (f) incrementing the value of n (Fig. 6, element

635; column 19, lines 1 – 3); and (g) repeating steps (c) through (f) until no nodes reply

to paging (Fig. 6, element 600), Plasson et al. also disclose expressly whereby nodes

beyond transmission range of other nodes but within transmission range of intermediate

nodes become known to said other nodes and become accessible to said other nodes

by relaying through said intermediate nodes (Fig. 3A, Fig. 3B; column 11, lines 6 – 11;

20 – 47).

Regarding Claims 2, 4, 17, 19, 33, Plasson et al. the method, network of claimed

wherein said certain node is further a gateway to another network (column 14, lines 47

– 50).

Regarding Claims 3, 16, 18, 38, Plasson et al. discloses the limitation of the

method of claimed comprising step: (h) repeating steps (a) through (g) with a different

node selected as the certain node (Fig. 5, element 500; Fig. 6 element 600; column 18,

lines 41 – 67; column 19, lines 1 – 13).

Regarding Claims 5, 43, 50, Plasson et al. discloses the limitation of the method

of claimed wherein the RF network is a short-range RF network (column 2, lines 16 –

18).

Regarding Claims 6, 20, 44, 51, Plasson et al. discloses the limitation of the

Method of claimed wherein the short-range RF network is a Bluetooth network (column

7, lines 61 – 67; column 8, lines 6 – 7).

Regarding Claims 7, 21, 30, Plasson et al. discloses the limitation of the method

of claimed wherein if a node comprising at least two transceivers (column 9, lines 59 –

67), the first one to answer paging is designated as a slave transceiver of the RF

network (column 3, line 48 – 51) and least one of the other transceivers is designated

as a master transceiver of the RF network (column 3, lines 43 – 45), and each

transceiver designated as a master does not answer paging (column 3, line 45).

Regarding Claims 8, 22, Plasson et al. discloses the limitation of the method of

claimed paging be performed by the master (column 3, lines 43 – 45).

Regarding Claims 9, 10, 11, 23, 24, 25, 31, 32, 34, 48, 49, Plasson et al.

discloses the limitation of the method of claimed wherein a node further including a

transceiver for communication with wireless terminals (column 7, lines 61 – 67),

whereby a wireless terminal in transmission range of a node may communicate with

another wireless terminal in transmission range of a node (column 8, lines 6 – 22).

Regarding Claim 12, 14, 26, Plasson et al. discloses the limitation of the method

of claimed wherein each transceiver further has a password associated with it (column

12, lines 38 – 40; column 15, lines 3 – 4), and wherein in step (c), passwords are

included in paging (column 15, lines 41 – 46); and a node does not reply to paging

unless the password included in paging matches the password associated with the

transceiver (column 15, lines 41 – 51, Table 1, Table 2, Table 3).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

10.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

11.   Claims 27, 28, 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Plasson et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6795688 B1) in view of Maletsky (U.S. Patent No.

6104279).

        Regarding claims 27, 28, 35, Plasson et al. discloses the limitation of configuring

an access point based RF network, the network comprising a plurality of network nodes

for communicating with other nodes (Fig. 3A, column 10, lines 33 – 40). Plasson et al.

does not disclose expressly claimed wherein further each transceiver has associated

with it a portable machine-readable tag containing the transceiver's unique identifier;

associated with the network is a tag reader for reading the machine-readable tags; and

step (a) comprises substeps: (a1) presenting each tag to the tag reader; and (a2)

transferring each output of the tag reader to the data store of the control node.

Maletsky discloses the limitation of claimed wherein further each transceiver has

associated with it a portable machine-readable tag containing the transceiver's unique

identifier (column 1, lines 59 – 60); associated with the network is a tag reader for

reading the machine-readable tags (column 1, lines 25 – 29); and step (a) comprises

substeps: (al) presenting each tag to the tag reader (column 1, lines 50 – 53); and (a2)

transferring each output of the tag reader to the data store of the control node (column

1, lines 53 – 56). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the

time the invention was made to modify Plasson et al. to include a claimed wherein

further each transceiver has associated with it a portable machine-readable tag

containing the transceiver's unique identifier; associated with the network is a tag reader

for reading the machine-readable tags; and step (a) comprises substeps: (al) presenting

each tag to the tag reader; and (a2) transferring each output of the tag reader to the

data store of the control node such as that taught by Maletsky in order to provide an

RFID tag identification method that minimizes the complexity of the design and

implementation of the base station and the RFID comprising the system (as suggested

by Maletsky, column 2, lines 57 – 60).

12.   Claims 39, 37, 29, 40, 41, 42, 45, 47, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, are

rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Plasson et al. (U.S. Patent

No. 6795688 B1) and Larsson et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6535498) as applied to claims 1,

13, 15, 46, 2, 4, 17, 19, 33, 3, 16, 18, 38, 5, 43, 50, 6, 20, 44, 51, 7, 21, 30, 8, 22, 9, 10,

11, 23, 24, 24, 31, 32, 34, 48, 49, 12, 14, 26, 27, 28, 35 above, and further in view of

Maletsky (U.S. Patent No. 6104279).

Regarding claims 39, 37, 29, 47, 52, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, Plasson et al.

discloses the limitation of a self-configuring RF network (Fig. 1, column 8, lines 29 – 44;

column 14, lines 47 – 50) comprising a plurality of nodes for communicating wirelessly

with other nodes of the RF network, wherein at least one of the nodes is selected as a

control node (Fig. 3A, column 10, lines 33 – 40), each node including a control logic

(Fig. 1, elements 120, 130; column 8, lines 23 – 28); a data store connected to the

control logic (Fig. 2, element 210; column 9, lines 43 – 50); at least one transceiver

connected to the control logic and identified by a unique address for communicating

wirelessly with other nodes of the network (Fig. 4A, element 410; column 12, lines 38 –

40); a transceiver list database connected to the data store for storing updateable

information of all transceivers of the RF network for network configuration (Fig. 4A,

column 15, lines 5 – 20); and a dynamic variable linked to the transceiver list database

for indicating position of each node in the RF network relative to the control node (

column 19, lines 24 – 29); wherein: (a) a transceiver of the control node pages other

transceivers in its transceiver list (column 3, lines 43 – 45); (b) a transceiver of the

control node detects other nodes within its coverage area according to response of said

other transceivers to paging (column 8, lines 12 – 22); (c) the control node's transceiver

list is updated according to said response of said other transceivers to paging (column

14, lines 47 – 52); (d) the control logic associates detected transceivers' information in

the control node's transceiver list with a current value of the dynamic variable (column

14, lines 1 – 11); and (e) the control logic directs propagating the updated contents of

the control node's transceiver list to all detected nodes in the network (column 13, lines

10 – 23); and (f) the control logic of each detected node directs incrementing the

dynamic variable (column 19, lines 6 – 7); (g) a transceiver of each node pages other

transceivers in its transceiver list; each node detects other nodes within the coverage

area of its transceiver according to response of said other transceivers to paging

(column 14, lines 26 – 40); (i) each node's control logic directs updating the node's

transceiver list according to response of said other transceivers to paging (column 13,

lines 10 – 23); (j) the node's control logic associates detected transceivers' information

in the node's transceiver list with a current value of the dynamic variable (column 19,

lines 6 – 7); (k) the control logic directs propagating the updated contents of each

node's transceiver list to all detected nodes in the network (column 13, lines 10 – 23);

andfunctions (g) through (k) are repeated until all nodes of the network are detected

(Fig. 6, element 600, column 18, lines 37 – 67; column 19, lines 1 – 13); and Plasson et

al. does not disclose expressly wherein the control logic of each node computes an

indication of current load carried by the node; each node dynamically transmits its load

indication at least to nodes within its transmission range; and each node dynamically

receives and stores load indications received from other nodes. Larsson et al. discloses

the limitation of wherein the control logic of each node computes an indication of current

load carried by the node (Fig.6, column 2, lines 24 – 32); each node dynamically

transmits its load indication at least to nodes within its transmission range; and each

node dynamically receives and stores load indications received from other nodes

(column 5, lines 5 – 14). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at

the time the invention was made to modify Plasson et al. to include a claimed wherein

the control logic of each node computes an indication of current load carried by the

node; each node dynamically transmits its load indication at least to nodes within its

transmission range; and each node dynamically receives and stores load indications

received from other nodes. such as that taught by Larsson et al. in order to allow

reactive ad-hoc routing protocols to determine whether more optimal routes exist

between the source node and the destination node (as suggested by Larsson et al.,

column 3, lines 66 – 68). However, both Plasson et al. and Larsson et al. fail to disclose

wherein associated with each transceiver is a unique password, provided with each

transceiver is a machine-readable tag on which is recorded the transceiver's unique

address and password and associated with the control node is a reader for reading

unique addresses and passwords from the tags and storing them in a first node's

transceiver list. Maletsky discloses the limitation of wherein associated with each

transceiver is a unique password, provided with each transceiver is a machine-readable

tag on which is recorded the transceiver's unique address and password and associated

with the control node is a reader for reading unique addresses and passwords from the

tags and storing them in a first node's transceiver list (Fig. 1B, column 3, lines 66 – 67;

column 4, lines 1 – 18). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at

the time the invention was made to modify both Plasson et al. and Larsson et al. to

include a wherein associated with each transceiver is a unique password, provided with

each transceiver is a machine-readable tag on which is recorded the transceiver's

unique address and password and associated with the control node is a reader for

reading unique addresses and passwords from the tags and storing them in a first

node's transceiver list.such as that taught by Maletsky in order to order to provide an

RFID tag identification method that minimizes the complexity of the design and

implementation of the base station and the RFID comprising the system (as suggested

by Maletsky, column 2, lines 57 – 60).

Regarding claims 40, 45, Plasson et al. discloses the limitation of a

self-configuring RF network (Fig. 1, column 8, lines 29 – 44; column 14, lines 47 – 50)

comprising a plurality of nodes for communicating wirelessly with other nodes of the RF

network, wherein at least one of the nodes is selected as a control node (Fig. 3A,

column 10, lines 33 – 40). Plasson et al. does not disclose expressly the RF network of

claimed wherein the control logic of each node dynamically calculates routes for

transmitting messages to the first node including relays through other nodes for nodes

not within transmission distance of the control node. Larsson et al. discloses the

limitation of the RF network of claimed wherein the control logic of each node

dynamically calculates routes for transmitting messages to the first node including

relays through other nodes for nodes not within transmission distance of the control

node. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to modify Plasson et al. to include the RF network of claimed

wherein the control logic of each node dynamically calculates routes for transmitting

messages to the first node including relays through other nodes for nodes not within

transmission distance of the control node (column 2, lines 1 – 21) such as that taught by

Larsson et al. in order to allow reactive ad-hoc routing protocols to determine whether

more optimal routes exist between the source node and the destination node (as

suggested by Larsson et al., column 3, lines 66 – 68).

Regarding claims 41, 53, Plasson et al. discloses the limitation of a

self-configuring RF network (Fig. 1, column 8, lines 29 – 44; column 14, lines 47 – 50)

comprising a plurality of nodes for communicating wirelessly with other nodes of the RF

network, wherein at least one of the nodes is selected as a control node (Fig. 3A,

column 10, lines 33 – 40). Plasson et al. does not disclose expressly the RF network of

claimed wherein a node not within transmission distance of the control node selects

routes to the first node traversing the fewest other nodes. Larsson et al. discloses the

limitation of the RF network of claim 40 wherein a node not within transmission distance

of the control node selects routes to the first node traversing the fewest other nodes

(Fig. 7, column 8, lines 6 – 12). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Plasson et al. to include the RF network of claimed wherein a node not within transmission distance of the control node selects routes to the first node traversing the fewest other nodes such as that taught by Larsson et al. in order to allow reactive ad-hoc routing protocols to determine whether more optimal routes exist between the source node and the destination node (as suggested by Larsson et al., column 3, lines 66 – 68).

Regarding claim 42, Plasson et al. discloses the limitation of a self-configuring RF network (Fig. 1, column 8, lines 29 – 44; column 14, lines 47 – 50) comprising a plurality of nodes for communicating wirelessly with other nodes of the RF network, wherein at least one of the nodes is selected as a control node (Fig. 3A, column 10, lines 33 – 40). Plasson et al. does not disclose expressly the RF network of claim 41 wherein if several routes traverse the fewest other nodes, a route is selected which has traverses nodes having least aggregate load indication. Larsson et al. discloses the limitation of the RF network of claimed wherein if several routes traverse the fewest other nodes, a route is selected which has traverses nodes having least aggregate load indication (column 5, lines 5 – 22; column8, lines 6 –12). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Plasson et al. to include the RF network of claimed wherein if several routes traverse the fewest other nodes, a route is selected which has traverses nodes having least aggregate load indication such as that taught by Larsson et al. in order to to allow reactive ad-hoc routing protocols to determine whether more optimal routes exist between the source

node and the destination node (as suggested by Larsson et al., column 3, lines 66 –

68).

Response to Arguments

13.   Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1 – 35, 37 - 61 have been

considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

14.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Andrew C. Lee whose telephone number is (571) 272-

3131. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:30am -

5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Wellington Chin can be reached on (571) 272-3134. The fax phone number

for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

ACL   June 23, 2005   Ajit Patel
                                                                         Primary Examiner